AD A095138

LEVEL Ⅱ

FINAL REPORT FOR CONTRACT N00014-78-C-0022 FOR THE PERIOD
1 OCTOBER 1977 - 30 SEPTEMBER 1980

James G. Greeno
University of Pittsburgh

January 26, 1981

Technical Report No. 7

DTIC
SELECTE
FEB 18 1981
E

DDC FILE COPY

SC

SC

81 2 17 187

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
Technical Report No. 7	AD-A095 138	14/TR-7

4. TITLE (and Subtitle)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
FINAL REPORT FOR CONTRACT N00014-78-C-0022 FOR THE PERIOD 1 OCTOBER 1977 - 30 SEPTEMBER 1980	Technical Report
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER

7. AUTHOR(s)	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
James G. Greeno	N00014-78-C-0022

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
University of Pittsburgh Learning Research & Development Center Pittsburgh, PA 15260	Prog. Ele.: 61153N Proj.: RR 042-06 Task Area: RR042-06-02 Work Unit: NR 157-408

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE
Personnel & Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, VA 22217	26 January 1981
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
	18

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
RR 04246 RR 043.0205	Unclassified
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

reasoning
problem solving
understanding
cognitive skill

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

This project examined processes of informal reasoning and relationships between informal and formal reasoning in problem solving. One set of studies focused on relationships between knowledge of problem-solving procedures and knowledge of general conceptual relationships. We have specified ways in which problem-solving performance can be influenced, and problem-solving procedures can be understood, because of their relationships to conceptual knowledge in the form of schemata. The second set of studies was concerned—

with relationships between general formal principles and cognitive proce-
dures. Contributions included a method for formally analyzing relationships
between procedures and constraints, and a theoretical and empirical anal-
ysis of understanding the principle of formal deductive consequence in the
context of geometry proof problems.

Final Report for Contract N00014-78-C-0022, for the period
1 October 1977 - 30 September 1980

James G. Greeno
University of Pittsburgh

ABSTRACT

This project examined processes of informal reasoning and
relationships between informal and formal reasoning in problem solving.
One set of studies focused on relationships between knowledge of
problem-solving procedures and knowledge of general conceptual
relationships. We have specified ways in which problem-solving performance
can be influenced, and problem-solving procedures can be understood,
because of their relationships to conceptual knowledge in the form of
schemata. The second set of studies was concerned with relationships
between general formal principles and cognitive procedures. Contributions
included a method for formally analyzing relationships between procedures
and constraints, and a theoretical and empirical analysis of understanding
the principle of formal deductive consequence in the context of geometry
proof problems.

1.0

OVERVIEW

This is the final report for Contract N00014-78-0022, for the period 1
October 1977 - 30 September 1980. The research examined processes of
informal reasoning in problem solving and relationships between informal
and formal reasoning.

In an important tradition in cognitive theory, correct thinking is
characterized as a set of formal principles to be followed. In modern
cognitive science, thinking is characterized as a set of cognitive
processes and structures, and cognitive theory consists of analyses of
these and their relationships to formal principles.

Informal reasoning includes thinking processes of two kinds: procedural knowledge and tacit conceptual knowledge. We have analyzed relationships between cognitive procedures and general conceptual knowledge in the form of schemata, resulting in clearer conceptualization of the role of understanding in planning, constructions, problem-solving set, and transfer related to meaningful learning.

In studies of relationships between formal principles and informal reasoning, a theory of procedural planning has been developed, providing a framework for analyzing relationships between procedures and general principles in the form of constraints, and an analysis of flawed or "buggy" procedures has been developed. An analysis was developed involving procedural knowledge for solving proof problems and the formal principle of deductive consequence; a theoretical analysis and an instructional experiment were conducted to specify the cognitive processes that constitute understanding of the principle underlying the procedural knowledge.

2.0

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this research was to contribute to a cognitive theory of reasoning and problem solving. Such a theory will identify the kinds of knowledge that are required for someone to reason successfully and solve problems.

One starting point for a theory of reasoning is in formal systems. In a tradition that includes, among others, Aristotle, Descartes (1637/1980), and Boole (1854), knowledge required for correct reasoning is characterized as a set of rules codified in a formal language. If one wishes to reason correctly in logic or science, one should learn the rules of thinking in the field, and with correct understanding of the rules, correct reasoning will follow. The way in which students are most often instructed in scientific fields seems to agree with this formalistic idea. Students are taught the formulas that describe relationships among quantitative properties--say, in electronic circuits or in mechanical systems. Examples are shown in which the formulas are used in solving problems, but if a student does not succeed in solving problems it is not unusual to say that the student failed because the formula was not "really" learned or understood.

Cognitive science provides a different view. Knowledge required for correct reasoning is characterized as a set of cognitive processes and information structures that can produce correct performance on reasoning and problem-solving tasks. Knowledge of formal principles may be included in the cognitive requirements for successful reasoning and problem solving. Such knowledge, however, may be in tacit, rather than explicit, form. Furthermore, formal knowledge is always incomplete; it does not provide a sufficient cognitive system for performance. As Ryle (1949) noted, knowledge of propositions, which includes explicit knowledge of formal principles, must be supplemented by knowledge of procedures which Ryle referred to as "knowing how." Another form of knowledge required for

successful reasoning was called "tacit knowledge" by Polanyi (1967), referring to conceptual ability that is not formulated explicitly.

In the psychological literature, the best-known discussion of the relationship between formal knowledge and informal conceptual processes was provided by Wertheimer (1945/1959). Along with other Gestalt theorists (e.g., Duncker, 1945; Kohler, 1927; Luchins, 1942), Wertheimer considered achievement of structural understanding as the primary requirement for successful reasoning and problem solving. Wertheimer explicitly distinguished between problem solving with understanding and problem solving in which solutions are obtained using a rote, mechanical procedure. In many of Wertheimer's examples, the mechanical procedure was an item of formal knowledge, and the cognitive process required for structural understanding was identified informally, often as a set of spatial relationships.

Most psychological studies of problem solving during the 1950's and 1960's were conducted in the framework of behaviorism or associationism, and theoretical analyses (e.g., Maltzman, 1955) were focused on factors influencing performance. In the 1970's, analyses of performance in problem solving have become more rigorous and more detailed with the development of information-processing concepts and theories largely stimulated by Newell and Simon's (1972) important studies.

In psychological studies of reasoning, a major concern has been to identify ways in which thinking is discrepant from rules of formal logic;

well known studies include those of Chapman and Chapman (1959), Henle (1962), Wason and Johnson-Laird (1972), and Woodworth and Sells (1935) Recent investigations have provided more specific hypotheses about the nature of cognitive procedures involved in performance of syllogistic reasoning tasks (e.g., Braine, 1978; Guyote & Sternberg, 1978; Johnson-Laird & Steedman, 1978; Osherson, 1975).

In addition to the major advances that have been made in understanding the procedural aspects of informal reasoning, some significant beginnings have been made toward analysis of conceptual aspects. Studies conducted thus far have considered knowledge required for intelligent representation of problems, especially in physics (McDermott & Larkin, 1978; Novak, 1976), and the nature of qualitative reasoning in solving problems in physics and electronics (Bundy, 1978; deKleer, 1975, 1979; Simon & Simon, 1978).

3.0

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

Results of research in this project have been in two general groups. One set of results involves relationships between two kinds of informal knowledge in problem solving. We have completed three analyses of relationships between general conceptual knowledge, in the form of schemata, and problem-solving procedures. The other set of results involves relationships between general formal principles and cognitive procedures. These analyses investigated ways in which knowledge of formal

principles, in the form of constraints on problem solutions, can influence generation and understanding of procedures for solution of problems.

3.1

Schemata and Problem-Solving Procedures

Our analyses of interactions between conceptual schemata and cognitive procedures were developed in three studies. First, we analyzed schematic structures involved in planning geometry proof problems. This analysis provided a plausible hypothesis about the way in which simple constructions are produced in problem solving. The hypothesis also gives an explanation of one kind of problem-solving set.

A second analysis dealt with the problem of meaningful learning. A hypothesis was developed regarding the role of conceptual schemata in the acquisition of new problem-solving procedures. The hypothesis provides an explanation of the way in which meaningful learning results in knowledge that can be transfered more successfully to new kinds of problems, as well as a form of understanding of the cognitive procedures that are learned.

The third analysis investigated relationships between task demands and cognitive procedures that are used in solving problems. We conducted an experimental study of a task in which subjects retrieved information about a spatial display. Interpretations of previous findings had hypothesized different forms of information used to represent locations of objects. We replicated previous empirical findings by varying the phrasing of questions

about a single spatial display, and proposed an interpretation in which performance differences result from differences in cognitive procedures for retrieving information and making inferences.

3.1.1   - Schema-Based Planning

The theoretical problem addressed in this study was the problem of constructions. In well structured problems, the materials presented in the problem situation are sufficient for solution of the problem. One way for a problem to have weak structure is to present an incomplete set of materials, so that the problem solver has to augment the problem space in order to find a solution.

Problems with incomplete initial problem spaces occur in the domain of geometry proofs ·in a form that turned out to be quite manageable for theoretical analysis. The incomplete problems are those in which the diagram presented in the problem must be augmented by the addition of an auxiliary line.

A computational model that simulates solution of problems requiring constructions was developed. Knowledge for problem solving is organized in the model in a way similar to that developed by Sacerdoti (1977), with knowledge about actions of varying degrees of generality. Knowledge of general actions used in planning includes patterns of problem features that constitute prerequisites for using the plans. These schematic patterns provide the basis for constructions when their components are partially but

not completely matched by features of the problem situation.

In addition to explaining the occurrence of constructions, the model also provided an explanation of a form of problem-solving set that has been studied extensively, notably by Luchins (1942). Problem-solving set occurs, according to this analysis, when global features of the problem situation are used to choose a plan for solving the problem, and then further activity takes place in the context of the goals and requirements of that plan.

The results of this study, including data from a few protocols and some experiments on set, were reported in Greeno, Magone & Chaiklin (1979). Further documentation, consisting of protocols from several problems involving constructions, was provided in Greeno (1979). Briefer summary reports of these results were included in two other papers (Greeno, 1980b; in press).

3.1.2 - Meaningful Learning

The analysis of meaningful learning was undertaken as part of a collaborative project with John Anderson, studying processes of learning problem-solving skills in geometry. A model was developed that simulates learning in two forms: one in which new cognitive procedures are simply associated to stimuli in the problem situation and one in which new material is connected to general conceptual schemata. The latter provides a hypothesis about the nature of meaningful learning.

Learning that was simulated was based on solutions of three example problems. In one problem, the meaningful learning system learned to apply a schema that was already known in a situation where it was not previously applicable. In a second problem, new procedural knowledge was added to a schema. And in a third problem, the learner formed a new schematic structure with previously existing schemata as subschemata of the new structure. In all three cases, the rote learner simply learned to do what was done in the example problem, forming productions with relatively specific problem features as the conditions.

The model seems to provide a plausible hypothesis about the nature of meaningful learning. It also shows how schemata that incorporate general conceptual knowledge can provide a basis for transfer to new kinds of problems. When a new kind of problem can be schematized using a conceptual structure that was learned previously, then problem-solving procedures associated with that schema are available for use in the new situation. Data in the form of thinking-aloud protocols on a transfer problem in geometry provided evidence that was generally consistent with the model's account of transfer.

Reports of our analysis of meaningful learning are in Anderson, Greeno, Kline, and Neves (in press) and in Greeno (1980a).

3.1.3 - Retrieval of Schematized Information

In previous experiments, Lea (1975) and Hintzman, O'Dell & Arndt

(1979) obtained evidence that led to quite different interpretations about the cognitive representation of spatial information. Lea's conclusion, based on reaction times to report objects displaced varying distances from a specified object, was that information about locations is stored as a circular list. Hintzman et al's conclusion, based on reaction times to move a stylus in the direction of a specified object, was that the spatial representation includes information about relative directions and distances between objects.

An experiment was conducted in which all subjects answered questions of the form, "What object is at X," where X was a location relative to a specified object, thus avoiding a substantial difference between the tasks used by Lea and by Hintzman et al. However, in one condition relative location was specified by displacement on the circumference of a circular display, and in the other condition location was specified by compass directions. In the data we obtained, Lea's findings were replicated in the displacement condition, and Hintzman et al's were replicated in the direction condition.

We propose an interpretation in which information about locations is stored in a spatial schema, and different retrieval procedures are induced by the different forms of questions used in the two tasks. This interpretation extends ideas about forms of cognitive representation in linear arrays, used for storing information about ordered sequences (e.g., Banks, 1977; Bower, 1971). Our empirical findings provide further documentation, along with Hintzman et al's results, for cognitive

representations that are distinctively spatial in their directional characteristics. In previous empirical demonstrations (e.g., Kosslyn & Pomerantz, 1977), support for spatial representation was related to consequences of information about distances.

Our findings are reported in Greeno, Magone, Siegel, and Mokwa (in press).

3.2

Formal Principles and Informal Procedural Knowledge

Three studies have been completed investigating relationships between knowledge of formal principles and cognitive procedures. In one analysis, general principles in the form of constraints were used as the basis of a theory of procedural planning. The result of the analysis is a theoretical framework that is generally applicable for analyzing the consequences of prescriptive principles that relate to cognitive procedures.

A second study analyzed processes of applying incomplete knowledge and creating new procedures by extending existing knowledge to new circumstances. The theory that resulted from this analysis explains the occurrence of flawed procedures on the basis of informal methods of patching existing procedural knowledge when conditions are inappropriate for use of the existing procedures.

In a third study we examined the understanding of formal principles

that are relevant to a set of problem-solving procedures. We found that students typically lack understanding of an important general principle, and developed a hypothesis about knowledge that would constitute at least implicit understanding of the principle. In a training study, we had some success in instructing student subjects in the procedure that was identified in our theoretical analysis.

3.2.1 - Formal Constraints in Planning

A theory was developed for analyzing relationships between a set of prescriptive principles, in the form of constraints, and a cognitive procedure that conforms to the constraints. The theory consists of a process that generates a data structure, called a planning net, that represents the steps in synthesizing a procedure based on the constraints. The analysis shows which components of a procedure are needed to conform to specific principles. Therefore, human performance that is faulty in specific ways can be taken as diagnostic evidence that the person lacks knowledge or understanding of specific principles that are violated by the performance flaws.

The analysis worked out in developing the theory involved a series of procedures involving a spatial model of arithmetic. Constraints were analyzed for performing subtraction using concrete objects. An important result of the analysis is a distinction between constraints that are essential in the goal of a procedure and constraints that are useful in making the procedure more efficient. Distinguishing between essential and

inessential constraints can provide a first step in the analysis of robustness of procedural knowledge, when circumstances make it impossible to conform to all the constraints of a normal procedure, and the adjustment that is made should sacrifice constraints that do not cause the major goal of the procedure to be violated.

The theory of planning nets is described in VanLehn and Brown (in press).

3.2.2 - Misapplication of Procedures and Generation of "Bugs"

Many cognitive procedures are not strongly grounded in a set of prescriptive principles that are known by the individual who can perform the procedures. When an individual encounters a situation in which existing procedures cannot be executed normally, some extension or modification of the procedures often occurs. This can lead to erroneous performance, and if the modification is stored in memory, a systematically flawed procedure may result.

An analysis of procedural misapplication has been completed and given the name "Repair Theory." The theory provides an explanation for an extensively compiled set of procedural flaws that occur in the domain of elementary arithmetic (Brown & Burton, 1978). We believe that the principles identified in this analysis contribute to an understanding of the importance of understanding the constraints that must be honored in modifying procedural knowledge, and also provide an important beginning for

a principled theory of procedural learning.

The theoretical analysis is reported in Brown and VanLehn (in press).

3.2.3 - Understanding of a Formal Principle About a Procedure

An analysis was performed of understanding of an important general principle that has to be honored for correct performance of a cognitive task, and often is not appreciated by individuals who learn to perform the task correctly. The principle studied was the concept of deductive consequence, which is the critical idea involved in construction of formal proofs. It is widely believed--and data that we collected in interviews of students supported the belief--that although students in geometry become quite skilled in constructing proofs, they do not acquire a deep understanding of the concept of proof.

Our main focus in studying the concept of formal proof was on a task of proof checking. In this task, a proof problem is presented with what is purported to be a solution. The subject's task is to evaluate the alleged proof, to determine whether it is valid, and to identify any error that may be present in it. This task tests a student's knowledge of the principle of deductive consequence in a way that is similar to the traditional experimental test of a subject's knowledge of a categorical concept, in which candidate examples are presented and the subject's task is to identify which are positive and which are negative examples.

We found that students in a geometry class performed poorly in tasks of checking proofs, especially when the error to be detected involved an omission of needed information. This suggested that their knowledge about proof was deficient in the important characteristic of deductive arguments; namely, that for each step there have been sufficient prior assertions to make the next step follow necessarily. A model of knowledge required for checking proofs was developed as a computer program, modifying an earlier model of proof construction (Greeno, 1978). The model provided a clear characterization of knowledge that would constitute implicit understanding of the principle of deductive consequence that is not required for constructing proofs. We designed training materials, based on the computational model, and succeeded in producing significant improvement in proof-checking performance by presenting this instruction to student subjects.

A brief report of our study of proof checking was included in Greeno (1980a), and a more complete report is in preparation.

4.0

REFERENCES

Anderson, J. R., Greeno, J. G., Kline, P. J., & Neves, D. M. Acquisition of problem-solving skill. In J. R. Anderson (Ed.), Cognitive skills and their acquisition. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, in press.

Banks, W. P. Encoding and processing of semantic information in comparative judgments. In G. H. Bower (Ed.), The psychology of learning and motivation: Advances in research and theory (Vol. 11). New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Boole, G. An investigation of the laws of thought. London: Walton and Maberly, 1854.

Bower, G. H. Adaptation-level coding of stimuli and serial position effects. In M. H. Appley (Ed.), Adaptation-level theory. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Braine, M. D. S. On the relation between the natural logic of reasoning and standard logic. Psychological Review, 1978, 85, 1-21.

Brown, J. S., & Burton, R. R. Diagnostic models for procedural bugs in basic mathematical skills. Cognitive Science, 1978, 2, 155-192.

Brown, J. S., & VanLehn, K. Toward a generative theory of "bugs." Cognitive Science, in press.

Bundy, A. Will it reach the top? Prediction in the mechanics world. Artificial Intelligence, 10, 1978, 129-146.

Chapman, L. J., & Chapman, J. P. Atmosphere effect re-examined. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1959, 58, 220-226.

de Kleer, J. Qualitative and quantitative knowledge in classical mechanics (Tech. Rep. AI-TR-352). Cambridge, Mass.: Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, December 1975.

de Kleer, J. Causal and teleological reasoning in circuit understanding. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, September 1979.

Descartes, R. Discourse on method (trans. D. A. Cress). Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett, 1980. (Originally published, 1637.)

Duncker, K. On problem solving. Psychological Monographs, 1945, 58(Whole No. 270).

Greeno, J. G. A study of problem solving. In R. Glaser (Ed.), Advances in instructional psychology (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1978.

Greeno, J. G. Constructions in geometry problem solving. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh, Learning Research and Development Center, 1979. (LRDC Publication 1979/8)

Greeno, J. G. Forms of understanding in mathematical problem solving. Paper presented at the meeting of the XXII International Congress of Psychology, Leipzig, July 1980. (a)

Greeno, J. G. Psychology of learning, 1960-1980: One participant's observations. American Psychologist, 1980, 35, 713-728. (b)

Greeno, J. G. Some examples of cognitive task analysis with instructional implications. In R. E. Snow, P. A. Federico, & W. E. Montague (Eds.), Aptitude, learning, and instruction: Cognitive process analyses of

learning and problem solving (Vol. 2). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, in press.

Greeno, J. G., Magone, M. E., & Chaiklin, S. Theory of constructions and set in problem solving. Memory & Cognition, 1979, 7, 445-461.

Greeno, J. G., Magone, M. E., Siegel, A. W., & Mokwa, J. J. Retrieving information about locations. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, Learning Research and Development Center, in press.

Guyote, M. J., & Sternberg, R. J. A transitive-chain theory of syllogistic reasoning. New Haven, Conn.: Department of Psychology, Yale University, April 1978.

Henle, M. On the relation between logic and thinking. Psychological Review, 1962, 69, 366-378.

Hintzman, D. L., O'Dell, C. S., & Arndt, D. R. Orientation in cognitive maps. Eugene, Oreg.: Department of Psychology, University of Oregon, 1979.

Johnson-Laird, P. N., & Steedman, M. The psychology of syllogisms. Cognitive Psychology, 1978, 10, 64-99.

Kohler, W. The mentality of apes. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1927.

Kosslyn, S. M., & Pomerantz, J. R. Imagery, propositions, and the form of internal representations. Cognitive Psychology, 1977, 9, 52-76.

Lea, G. Chronometric analysis of the method of loci. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 1975, 1, 95-104.

Luchins, A. S. Mechanization in problem solving. Psychological Monographs, 1942, 54(Whole No. 248).

Maltzman, I. Thinking: From a behavioristic point of view. Psychological Review, 1955, 62, 275-286.

McDermott, J., & Larkin, J. H. Re-representing textbook physics problems. In Proceedings of the Second National Conference, Canadian Society for Computational Studies of Intelligence. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto, 1978.

Newell, A., & Simon, H. A. Human problem solving. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Novak, G. S. Computer understanding of physics problems stated in natural langugage. American Journal of Computational Linguistics, 1976, Microfiche 53.

Osherson, D. N. Logical abilities in children (Vol. 3) Reasoning in adolescence: Deductive inference. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1975.

Polanyi, M. The tacit dimension. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1967.

Ryle, G. The concept of mind. London: Hutchinson, 1949.

Sacerdoti, E. D. A structure for plans and behavior. New York: Elsevier-North Holland Publishing Co., 1977.

Simon, D. P., & Simon, H. A. Individual differences in solving physics problems. In R. S. Siegler (Ed.), Children's thinking: What develops? Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1978.

VanLehn, K., & Brown, J. S. Planning nets: A representation for formalizing analogies and semantic models of procedural skills. In R. E. Snow, P. A. Federico, & W. E. Montague (Eds.), Aptitude, learning, and instruction: Cognitive process analyses of learning and problem solving (Vol. 2). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, in press.

Wason, P. C., & Johnson-Laird, P. N. Psychology of reasoning: Structure and content. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Wertheimer, M. Productive thinking. New York: Harper & Row, 1945. (Enlarged edition, 1959)

Woodworth, R. S., & Sells, S. B. An atmosphere effect in syllogistic reasoning. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1935, 18, 451-460.

Navy

1   Dr. Ed Aiken
    Navy Personnel R&D Center
    San Diego, CA 92152

1   Meryl S. Baker
    NPRDC
    Code P309
    San Diego, CA 92152

1   Dr. Robert Breaux
    Code N-711
    NAVTRAEQUIPCEN
    Orlando, FL 32813

1   Dr. Richard Elster
    Department of Administrative Sciences
    Naval Postgraduate School
    Monterey, CA 93940

1   DR. PAT FEDERICO
    NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CENTER
    SAN DIEGO, CA 92152

1   Dr. John Ford
    Navy Personnel R&D Center
    San Diego, CA 92152

1   Dr. Henry M. Halff
    Department of Psychology,C-009
    University of California at San Diego
    La Jolla, CA 92093

1   LT Steven D. Harris, MSC, USN
    Code 6021
    Naval Air Development Center
    Warminster, Pennsylvania 18974

1   Dr. Jim Hollan
    Code 304
    Navy Personnel R & D Center
    San Diego, CA 92152

1   CDR Charles W. Hutchins
    Naval Air Systems Command Hq
    AIR-340F
    Navy Department
    Washington, DC 20361

1   CDR Robert S. Kennedy
    Head, Human Performance Sciences
    Naval Aerospace Medical Research Lab
    Box 29407
    New Orleans, LA 70189

1   Dr. Norman J. Kerr
    Chief of Naval Technical Training
    Naval Air Station Memphis (75)
    Millington, TN 38054

1   Dr. William L. Maloy
    Principal Civilian Advisor for
       Education and Training
    Naval Training Command, Code 00A
    Pensacola, FL 32508

1   CAPT Richard L. Martin, USN
    Prospective Commanding Officer
    USS Carl Vinson (CVN-70)
    Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co
    Newport News, VA 23607

1   Dr. James McBride
    Navy Personnel R&D Center
    San Diego, CA 92152

1   Dr William Montague
    Navy Personnel R&D Center
    San Diego, CA 92152

1   Library
    Naval Health Research Center
    P. O. Box 85122
    San Diego, CA 92138

1   Naval Medical R&D Command
    Code 44
    National Naval Medical Center
    Bethesda, MD 20014

1   Ted M. I. Yellen
    Technical Information Office, Code 201
    NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CENTER
    SAN DIEGO, CA 92152

1   Library, Code P201L
    Navy Personnel R&D Center
    San Diego, CA 92152

Navy

1   Technical Director
    Navy Personnel R&D Center
    San Diego, CA 92152

6   Commanding Officer
    Naval Research Laboratory
    Code 2627
    Washington, DC 20390

1   Psychologist
    ONR Branch Office
    Bldg 114, Section D
    666 Summer Street
    Boston, MA 02210

1   Psychologist
    ONR Branch Office
    536 S. Clark Street
    Chicago, IL 60605

1   Office of Naval Research
    Code 437
    800 N. Quincy SStreet
    Arlington, VA 22217

5   Personnel & Training Research Programs
        (Code 458)
    Office of Naval Research
    Arlington, VA 22217

1   Psychologist
    ONR Branch Office
    1030 East Green Street
    Pasadena, CA 91101

1   Special Asst. for Education and
        Training (OP-01E)
    Rm. 2705 Arlington Annex
    Washington, DC 20370

1   Office of the Chief of Naval Operations
    Research Development & Studies Branch
        (OP-115)
    Washington, DC 20350

1   Dr. Donald F. Parker
    Graduate School of Business Administrati
    University of Michigan
    Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Navy

1   LT Frank C. Petho, MSC, USN (Ph.D)
    Code L51
    Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laborat
    Pensacola, FL 32508

1   Dr. Gary Poock
    Operations Research Department
    Code 55PK
    Naval Postgraduate School
    Monterey, CA 93940

1   Roger W. Remington, Ph.D
    Code L52
    NAMRL
    Pensacola, FL 32508

1   Dr. Bernard Rimland (03B)
    Navy Personnel R&D Center
    San Diego, CA 92152

1   Dr. Worth Scanland
    Chief of Naval Education and Training
    Code N-5
    NAS, Pensacola, FL 32508

1   Dr. Robert G. Smith
    Office of Chief of Naval Operations
    OP-987H
    Washington, DC 20350

1   Dr. Alfred F. Smode
    Training Analysis & Evaluation Group
        (TAEG)
    Dept. of the Navy
    Orlando, FL 32813

1   Dr. Richard Sorensen
    Navy Personnel R&D Center
    San Diego, CA 92152

1   Roger Weissinger-Baylon
    Department of Administrative Sciences
    Naval Postgraduate School
    Monterey, CA 93940

1   Dr. Robert Wisher
    Code 309
    Navy Personnel R&D Center
    San Diego, CA 92152

Navy

1   Mr John H. Wolfe
    Code P310
    U. S. Navy Personnel Research and
        Development Center
    San Diego, CA 92152

Army

1   Technical Director
    U. S. Army Research Institute for the
        Behavioral and Social Sciences
    5001 Eisenhower Avenue
    Alexandria, VA 22333

1   HQ USAREUE & 7th Army
    ODCSOPS
    USAAREUE Director of GED
    APO New York 09403

1   DR. RALPH DUSEK
    U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
    5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE
    ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333

1   Dr. Dexter Fletcher
    U.S. Army Research Institute
    5001 Eisenhower Avenue
    Alexandria,VA 22333

1   DR. FRANK J. HARRIS
    U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
    5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE
    ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333

1   Col Frank Hart
    Army Research Institute for the
        Behavioral & Social Sciences
    5001 Eisenhower Blvd.
    Alexandria, VA 22333

1   Dr. Michael Kaplan
    U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
    5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE
    ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333

1   Dr. Milton S. Katz
    Training Technical Area
    U.S. Army Research Institute
    5001 Eisenhower Avenue
    Alexandria, VA 22333

1   Dr. Harold F. O'Neil, Jr.
    Attn: PERI-OK
    Army Research Institute
    5001 Eisenhower Avenue
    Alexandria, VA 22333

Army

1   Dr. Robert Sasmor
    U. S. Army Research Institute for the
        Behavioral and Social Sciences
    5001 Eisenhower Avenue
    Alexandria, VA 22333

1   Dr. Frederick Steinheiser
    U. S. Army Reserch Institute
    5001 Eisenhower Avenue
    Alexandria, VA 22333

1   Dr. Joseph Ward
    U.S. Army Research Institute
    5001 Eisenhower Avenue
    Alexandria, VA 22333

Air Force

1   Dr. Earl A. Alluisi
    HQ, AFHRL (AFSC)
    Brooks AFB, TX 78235

1   Dr. Genevieve Haddad
    Program Manager
    Life Sciences Directorate
    AFOSR
    Bolling AFB, DC 20332

1   Dr. Marty Rockway
    Technical Director
    AFHRL(OT)
    Williams AFB, AZ 58224

2   3700 TCHTW/TTGH Stop 32
    Sheppard AFB, TX 76311

1   Jack A. Thorp, Maj., USAF
    Life Sciences Directorate
    AFOSR
    Bolling AFB, DC 20332

Marines   Other DoD

1   H. William Greenup   12   Defense Technical Information Center
    Education Advisor (E031)   Cameron Station, Bldg 5
    Education Center, MCDEC   Alexandria, VA 22314
    Quantico, VA 22134   Attn: TC

1   Special Assistant for Marine   1   Dr. Craig I. Fields
        Corps Matters   Advanced Research Projects Agency
    Code 100M   1400 Wilson Blvd.
    Office of Naval Research   Arlington, VA 22209
    800 N. Quincy St.
    Arlington, VA 22217   1   Military Assistant for Training and
                                             Personnel Technology
1   DR. A.L. SLAFKOSKY   Office of the Under Secretary of Defense
    SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR (CODE RD-1)   for Research & Engineering
    HQ, U.S. MARINE CORPS   Room 3D129, The Pentagon
    WASHINGTON, DC 20380   Washington, DC 20301

Civil Govt   Non Govt

1   Dr. Susan Chipman   1   Dr. John R. Anderson
    Learning and Development   Department of Psychology
    National Institute of Education   Carnegie Mellon University
    1200 19th Street NW   Pittsburgh, PA 15213
    Washington, DC 20208
                                        1   Anderson, Thomas H., Ph.D.
1   Dr. Joseph I. Lipson   Center for the Study of Reading
    SEDR W-638   174 Children's Research Center
    National Science Foundation   51 Gerty Drive
    Washington, DC 20550   Champiagn, IL 61820

1   William J. McLaurin   1   Dr. John Annett
    Rm. 301, Internal Revenue Service   Department of Psychology
    2221 Jefferson Davis Highway   University of Warwick
    Arlington, VA 22202   Coventry CV4 7AL
                                            ENGLAND

1   Dr. Arthur Melmed
    National Intitute of Education   1   DR. MICHAEL ATWOOD
    1200 19th Street NW   SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INSTITUTE
    Washington, DC 20208   40 DENVER TECH. CENTER WEST
                                            7935 E. PRENTICE AVENUE
1   Dr. Andrew R. Molnar   ENGLEWOOD, CO 80110
    Science Education Dev.
        and Research   1   1 psychological research unit
    National Science Foundation   Dept. of Defense (Army Office)
    Washington, DC 20550   Campbell Park Offices
                                            Canberra   ACT 2600, Australia

1   Personnel R&D Center
    Office of Personnel Managment   1   Dr. Alan Baddeley
    1900 E Street NW   Medical Research Council
    Washington, DC 20415   Applied Psychology Unit
                                            15 Chaucer Road
1   Dr. Frank Withrow   Cambridge CB2 2EF
    U. S. Office of Education   ENGLAND
    400 Maryland Ave. SW
    Washington, DC 20202   1   Dr. Patricia Baggett
                                            Department of Psychology
1   Dr. Joseph L. Young, Director   University of Denver
    Memory & Cognitive Processes   University Park
    National Science Foundation   Denver, CO 80208
    Washington, DC 20550
                                        1   Mr Avron Barr
                                            Department of Computer Science
                                            Stanford University
                                            Stanford, CA 94305

Non Govt   Non Govt

1   Dr. Nicholas A. Bond   1   Dr. Micheline Chi
     Dept. of Psychology   Learning R & D Center
     Sacramento State College   University of Pittsburgh
     600 Jay Street   3939 O'Hara Street
     Sacramento, CA 95819   Pittsburgh, PA 15213

1   Dr. Lyle Bourne   1   Dr. William Clancey
     Department of Psychology   Department of Computer Science
     University of Colorado   Stanford University
     Boulder, CO 80309   Stanford, CA 94305

1   Dr. John S. Brown   1   Dr. Allan M. Collins
     XEROX Palo Alto Research Center   Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.
     3333 Coyote Road   50 Moulton Street
     Palo Alto, CA 94304   Cambridge, Ma 02138

1   Dr. Bruce Buchanan   1   Dr. Lynn A. Cooper
     Department of Computer Science   LRDC
     Stanford University   University of Pittsburgh
     Stanford, CA 94305   3939 O'Hara Street
                                           Pittsburgh, PA 15213
1   DR. C. VICTOR BUNDERSON
     WICAT INC.   1   Dr. Meredith P. Crawford
     UNIVERSITY PLAZA, SUITE 10   American Psychological Association
     1160 SO. STATE ST.   1200 17th Street, N.W.
     OREM, UT 84057   Washington, DC 20036

1   Dr. Pat Carpenter   1   Dr. Hubert Dreyfus
     Department of Psychology   Department of Philosophy
     Carnegie-Mellon University   University of California
     Pittsburgh, PA 15213   Berkely, CA 94720

1   Dr. John B. Carroll   1   LCOL J. C. Eggenberger
     Psychometric Lab   DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL APPLIED RESEARC
     Univ. of No. Carolina   NATIONAL DEFENCE HQ
     Davie Hall 013A   101 COLONEL BY DRIVE
     Chapel Hill, NC 27514   OTTAWA, CANADA K1A OK2

1   Charles Myers Library   1   Dr. Ed Feigenbaum
     Livingstone House   Department of Computer Science
     Livingstone Road   Stanford University
     Stratford   Stanford, CA 94305
     London E15 2LJ
     ENGLAND   1   Dr. Richard L. Ferguson
                                           The American College Testing Program
1   Dr. William Chase   P.O. Box 168
     Department of Psychology   Iowa City, IA 52240
     Carnegie Mellon University
     Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Non Govt

Non Govt

1   Mr. Wallace Feurzeig
    Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.
    50 Moulton St.
    Cambridge, MA 02138

1   Dr. Harold Hawkins
    Department of Psychology
    University of Oregon
    Eugene OR 97403

1   Dr. Victor Fields
    Dept. of Psychology
    Montgomery College
    Rockville, MD 20850

1   Dr. James R. Hoffman
    Department of Psychology
    University of Delaware
    Newark, DE 19711

1   Dr. John R. Frederiksen
    Bolt Beranek & Newman
    50 Moulton Street
    Cambridge, MA 02138

1   Glenda Greenwald, Ed.
    "Human Intelligence Newsletter"
    P. O. Box 1163
    Birmingham, MI 48012

1   Dr. Alinda Friedman
    Department of Psychology
    University of Alberta
    Edmonton, Alberta
    CANADA T6G 2E9

1   Dr. Earl Hunt
    Dept. of Psychology
    University of Washington
    Seattle, WA 98105

1   Dr. Steven W. Keele
    Dept. of Psychology
    University of Oregon
    Eugene, OR 97403

1   Dr. R. Edward Geiselman
    Department of Psychology
    University of California
    Los Angeles, CA 90024

1   Dr. Walter Kintsch
    Department of Psychology
    University of Colorado
    Boulder, CO 80302

1   DR. ROBERT GLASER
    LRDC
    UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
    3939 O'HARA STREET
    PITTSBURGH, PA 15213

1   Dr. David Kieras
    Department of Psychology
    University of Arizona
    Tuscon, AZ 85721

1   Dr. Marvin D. Glock
    217 Stone Hall
    Cornell University
    Ithaca, NY 14853

1   Dr. Kenneth A. Klivington
    Program Officer
    Alfred P. Sloan Foundation
    630 Fifth Avenue
    New York, NY 10111

1   Dr. Daniel Gopher
    Industrial & Management Engineering
    Technion-Israel Institute of Technology
    Haifa
    ISRAEL

1   Dr. Stephen Kosslyn
    Harvard University
    Department of Psychology
    33 Kirkland Street
    Cambridge, MA 02138

1   DR. JAMES G. GREENO
    LRDC
    UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
    3939 O'HARA STREET
    PITTSBURGH, PA 15213

Non Govt

1   Mr. Marlin Kroger
    1117 Via Goleta
    Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

1   Dr. Jill Larkin
    Department of Psychology
    Carnegie Mellon University
    Pittsburgh, PA 15213

1   Dr. Alan Lesgold
    Learning R&D Center
    University of Pittsburgh
    Pittsburgh, PA 15260

1   Dr. Michael Levine
    Department of Educational Psychology
    210 Education Bldg.
    University of Illinois
    Champaign, IL 61801

1   Dr. Robert A. Levit
    Director, Behavioral Sciences
    The BDM Corporation
    7915 Jones Branch Drive
    McClean, VA 22101

1   Dr. Charles Lewis
    Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen
    Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
    Oude Boteringestraat
    Groningen
    NETHERLANDS

1   Dr. Erik McWilliams
    Science Education Dev. and Research
    National Science Foundation
    Washington, DC 20550

1   Dr. Mark Miller
    Computer Science Laboratory
    Texas Instruments, Inc.
    Mail Station 371, P.O. Box 225936
    Dallas, TX 75265

1   Dr. Allen Munro
    Behavioral Technology Laboratories
    1845 Elena Ave., Fourth Floor
    Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Non Govt

1   Dr. Donald A Norman
    Dept. of Psychology C-009
    Univ. of California, San Diego
    La Jolla, CA 92093

1   Dr. Jesse Orlansky
    Institute for Defense Analyses
    400 Army Navy Drive
    Arlington, VA 22202

1   Dr. Seymour A. Papert
    Massachusetts Institute of Technology
    Artificial Intelligence Lab
    545 Technology Square
    Cambridge, MA 02139

1   Dr. James A. Paulson
    Portland State University
    P.O. Box 751
    Portland, OR 97207

1   MR. LUIGI PETRULLO
    2431 N. EDGEWOOD STREET
    ARLINGTON, VA 22207

1   Dr. Martha Polson
    Department of Psychology
    University of Colorado
    Boulder, CO 80302

1   DR. PETER POLSON
    DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY
    UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
    BOULDER, CO 80309

1   Dr. Steven E. Poltrock
    Department of Psychology
    University of Denver
    Denver,CO 80208

1   MINRAT M. L. RAUCH
    P II 4
    BUNDESMINISTERIUM DER VERTEIDIGUNG
    POSTFACH 1328
    D-53 BONN 1, GERMANY

Non Govt   Non Govt

1   Dr. Fred Reif   1   Dr. Robert Smith
    SESAME   Department of Computer Science
    c/o Physics Department   Rutgers University
    University of California   New Brunswick, NJ 08903
    Berkely, CA 94720
                                     1   Dr. Richard Snow
1   Dr. Andrew M. Rose   School of Education
    American Institutes for Research   Stanford University
    1055 Thomas Jefferson St. NW   Stanford, CA 94305
    Washington, DC 20007
                                     1   Dr. Robert Sternberg
1   Dr. Ernst Z. Rothkopf   Dept. of Psychology
    Bell Laboratories   Yale University
    600 Mountain Avenue   Box 11A, Yale Station
    Murray Hill, NJ 07974   New Haven, CT 06520

1   DR. WALTER SCHNEIDER   1   DR. ALBERT STEVENS
    DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY   BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC.
    UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS   50 MOULTON STREET
    CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820   CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

1   Dr. Alan Schoenfeld   1   David E. Stone, Ph.D.
    Department of Mathematics   Hazeltine Corporation
    Hamilton College   7680 Old Springhouse Road
    Clinton, NY 13323   McLean, VA 22102

1   DR. ROBERT J. SEIDEL   1   DR. PATRICK SUPPES
    INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY GROUP   INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL STUDIES IN
        HUMRRO   THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
    300 N. WASHINGTON ST.   STANFORD UNIVERSITY
    ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314   STANFORD, CA 94305

1   Committee on Cognitive Research 1   Dr. Kikumi Tatsuoka
    % Dr. Lonnie R. Sherrod   Computer Based Education Research
    Social Science Research Council   Laboratory
    605 Third Avenue   252 Engineering Research Laboratory
    New York, NY 10016   University of Illinois
                                        Urbana, IL 61801
1   Robert S. Siegler
    Associate Professor   1   Dr. John Thomas
    Carnegie-Mellon University   IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center
    Department of Psychology   P.O. Box 218
    Schenley Park   Yorktown Heights, NY 10598
    Pittsburgh, PA 15213
                                    1   Dr. Douglas Towne
1   Dr. Edward E. Smith   Univ. of So. California
    Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.   Behavioral Technology Labs
    50 Moulton Street   1845 S. Elena Ave.
    Cambridge, MA 02138   Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Non Govt

1   Dr. J. Uhlaner
    Perceptronics, Inc.
    6271 Variel Avenue
    Woodland Hills, CA 91364

1   Dr. Benton J. Underwood
    Dept. of Psychology
    Northwestern University
    Evanston, IL 60201

1   Dr. Phyllis Weaver
    Graduate School of Education
    Harvard University
    200 Larsen Hall, Appian Way
    Cambridge, MA 02138

1   Dr. David J. Weiss
    N660 Elliott Hall
    University of Minnesota
    75 E. River Road
    Minneapolis, MN 55455

1   DR. GERSHON WELTMAN
    PERCEPTRONICS INC.
    6271 VARIEL AVE.
    WOODLAND HILLS, CA 91367

1   Dr. Keith T. Wescourt
    Information Sciences Dept.
    The Rand Corporation
    1700 Main St.